

The Intelligent Trotskyist's Guide to the Political Committee's *Canada and the Crisis of World Imperialism*

by Wayne Roberts, Toronto local, West branch

(From LSA/LSO Discussion Bulletin 42, April 1973)

By Way of Introduction

In *Canada and the Crisis of World Imperialism*, the P.C. (Political Committee, governing body of the LSA/LSO --ed.) attempts to come to grips with many of the crucial questions facing the revolutionary left on the issue of Canadian nationalism. These problems can be basically resolved through answers to the following questions:

1. What is the nature of the Canadian bourgeoisie in terms of its relation to the Canadian and world economy, especially vis-a-vis the United States?
2. What is its relation to the Canadian state in terms of this process?
3. What is the historical function of nationalism in relation to these processes?
4. What is the function of nationalism in the radicalization today?
5. What is the correct program of the L.S.A. in relation to these processes?

In an earlier contribution to the discussion, I attempted to point out that the evaluation made by the P.C. on these matters was based on inadequate information that led them to consistently incorrect positions. Ross Dowson has arrived at similar conclusions on the basis of his own prodigious research. It seems reasonable to suggest that the current state of documentation has served to undermine virtually every important underpinning to the P.C. position.

However, a great amount of confusion still survives and hampers the full and meaningful discussion that is still necessary. A good part of this confusion derives from the pronounced tendency of the P.C. document, and P.C. argumentation generally, to a scattergun approach to the debate. For instance, it is sometimes unclear whether the P.C. is equating the views of some people in the movement with bourgeois nationalism, whether the P.C. is confusing historic with conjunctural tasks, or whether the P.C. feels called upon to lecture on the ABC's of Marxism rather than pay attention to mere facts. Alternating between a cannon and a scattergun is useful both in terms of creating a big noise and in terms of pointing out holes in various arguments. Perhaps the P.C. feels this is necessary as a first step in the development of a Marxist position on this question. However, in the meantime, it has created a great deal of unnecessary confusion. Moreover, in the treatment of highly complex matters, the use of cannons and scatterguns does not lead to an appreciation of appropriate nuances. On the contrary, it leads to ambiguity and gaping holes.

Because of this, it has become necessary to treat the P.C. document not only in terms of its main theses, but also in terms of its method of development. This document is intended, therefore, as an essentially point-by-point review of the P.C. argument. Hopefully comrades will at least find it useful to read (*my document*) in conjunction with the P.C. document so that they can gauge its development point-by-point. More hopefully still, they may find it a useful contribution to the total demolition of the P.C. document, a fate which the latter richly deserves.

At any rate, let us begin.

On page 1, point 2, the P.C. identifies the main processes underlying the present debate on Canada-U.S.-world relations as the lack of investment possibilities in the workers states and

the colonial world which have led to increased interpenetration of trade and investment among imperialist powers. There are a number of limitations to this analysis, among them being:

- a) they begin by equating the current state of Canada-U.S. economic relations with the relations between the U.S. and the rest of the world. Statistics show that American investment in Canada is at least quantitatively different.
- b) The American search for resources is not mentioned.
- c) The "multinational corporation" is not introduced as a factor of any importance (*emphasis by the web ed.*)

On pages 1 and 2, point 3, it is argued that the growth of "multinationals" has exacerbated inter-imperialist rivalry. Realignments resulting from this have led to the EEC in Europe and economic nationalism in the U.S. This misses the essence of the phenomenon which is the **monopolist** (*author's emphasis*) strategy of "multinationals." In Europe this led to the EEC. In the U.S., it results in the opposition of American "multinationals" to economic nationalism. **A misreading of this crucial distinction is partially at the root of the P.C.'s incorrect projection of a nationalist turn on the part of the Canadian bourgeoisie. (*emphasis by the web ed.*)**

On page 3, point 4, we learn how the internationalization of production has challenged the self-sufficiency of national capitalisms even as capitalists become increasingly dependent on their nation states to guarantee profits and stability. **This neatly sidesteps the question of whose monopoly profits are being guaranteed. Does the Canadian state only protect Canadian profits? (*Emphasis by the web ed.*)**

On page 3 and 4, point 5, it is stressed that the nation state will remain the main instrument of bourgeois rule. This rather arbitrarily equates the repressive and planning function of the state. **The state as a repressive apparatus may maintain its full force even as mechanisms of economic planning are increasingly alienated from it by the internationalization of production (*Emphasis by the web ed.*)**

The error made here is significant and indicative. The P.C. is being governed by an apocalyptic rather than dialectical frame of mind. It has more in common with the views of Dr. Johnson that patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel than it does with Marxism. The P.C. is confusing here the historic function of the state to act as the roost for national capitalism and to repress the rebellion of the working masses with its conjunctural tasks of facilitating, overseeing and nationalizing the development of the bourgeoisie. It is only at specific junctures that these two tasks intersect. For the time being its main task is defined in terms of the continentalization of the economy. This has not interrupted its repressive role: in fact it has often served as an impetus, (ie. the fear that the Quebec crisis could lead to an international hesitation to invest in Quebec). At any rate, it is important to distinguish, at least analytically, these two functions. **An apocalyptic view of the final essence of the state cannot grasp the totality of the significance of nationalism. It reflects a reductionist rather than a dialectical methodology (*Emphasis by the web ed.*)**

The short-comings of the P.C. in this regard reflect a weakness of their overall politics. They make the same mistake when they discuss the "objective" ie. historically, socialist role of the womens' or students' movement. This leads them to dispense with or defer from propaganda in these movements. Why do with words what history will do in deeds? This equation of historic and conjunctural tasks has led in some cases to a spontaneist, agitational view of work in certain movements, a view which can ultimately lead to reformism. In this discussion we see the other side of the coin of the same methodology. It will eventually come out in a maximalist concept of political intervention.

On page 5 , point 7 , we are treated to a lesson in the ABC's of socialism. Revolutionaries do not align with one bourgeois against another. They find the enemy in their own country. One wonders here who the P.C. is defining as the opposition in the movement in this repetition of truisms. **But again the main question is sidestepped. Do we oppose Eatons first because it is at home before we proceed to Imperial Oil? The point remains to be identified — who is the enemy at home? (Emphasis by the web ed.)**

On pages 5 and 6 , point 8 , we come to our "monopolized" (?) bourgeoisie, "in full control of the Canadian state apparatus, and through it, of the Canadian economy." This, it must be said, is an interesting revision of the Marxist concept of the relations of state and economy. The Canadian state, it appears, from the following lines, is responsible for the creation of the Canadian bourgeoisie. We then pass on to an assertion of large Canadian semicolonial holdings. Since this is a catalogue of sins rather than an analysis, there is of course no portrayal of the functions of these holdings abroad vis-a-vis American capital.

On page 6, point 9 , we learn that U.S. direct investment has replaced British portfolios. This has led to trade flows "along the natural (?) north-south routes": an interesting statement of classical liberal political economy, devoid of any concept of power. Despite this and other evidence of continuing integration, the prospects of inter-imperialist rivalry and American protectionism "can lead to attempts to reorient Canadian trade to some degree within world imperialism towards a lesser reliance on U.S. markets. The U.S. remains, however, Canada's chief customer, with an overwhelming margin over the second-ranked country." It is difficult to say whether this statement represents ambiguity or confusion. Since this is one of the kingpins of the P.C.'s assumptions, it would be useful if they would resolve this. In the process, the presentation of evidence might also prove useful.

On pages 6 and 7 , point 10 , Jesuitical insight comes to the fore. Shifting the topic once again from Canada's relation to U.S. imperialism to Canada's relation to world imperialism, our ever-cautious P.C. hesitates to calculate the longevity of U.S. hegemony in world imperialism. Japanese and European corporations may be gaining ground but to conjure up "a constantly shifting balance of forces in which the second rank power of yesterday frequently surges forward to catch up and bypass its earlier-developed neighbor" is to confuse historical epochs. This concept was useful for Veblen's classic study of German economic development prior to World War I, but it is no longer on the historical agenda.

Point 11 , pages 7 and 8 , argues that a projection of assimilation of Canadian into American capitalism is wrong. They are, of course, correct to point out "antagonistic interests" and "underlying frictions" to this process. But do these arise from different strategies in the Canadian bourgeoisie or activist versus passivist tactics? That is the key question that remains unresolved in the evidence that follows. Denison Mines, Home Oil, the Watkins, Wahn and Gray Reports are duly cited although for some reason there is no mention of the Mercantile affair, the *Times-Readers Digest* affair or the fact that no Royal Commission proposals have yet been acted on. At any rate, we are assured, at least Wall Street can see the antagonisms. That is why surcharge exemptions were only (!!) made on auto parts and energy resources. Is it also why Senator Hartke is predisposed to continental free trade?

Point 12, page 9 , tells us there is no process of semi-colonization going on. Apparently it is not necessary to have evidence to state that Canadian capitalists still control the economy and its most profitable sectors. This lack of evidence is especially useful in the statement that "the balance of capital movements by U.S. corporations remains in the direction of investment into Canada." This means that when we arrive at point 21a, part of which is in stark contradiction, we do not have to bother with new evidence and figures. (At any rate, the statement is totally false) (Emphasis by the web ed.)

Point 13, page 10, attempts to round out the distorted picture of American holdings in Canada with a full portrayal of Canadian capitalist control of finance, transportation, public utilities, etc. While the present state of documentation has only shown one of these examples to be totally unfounded and another placed in incorrect context, critics can take heart in the fact that a faulty theoretical equation is made with "the key sectors of the economy" and the economic macrostructure within which finance and industrial capital plays its role. **The error is particularly pronounced in their discussion of the role of the Canadian state. The repeated attempts of the P.C. to portray the state as a fortress of independent Canadian capitalism illustrate the opposite. As even bourgeois economists have lamented, the state's role in the economy has been on the level of macrostructure rather than direction. More correctly it has alternated between various roles — the provision of overall social overhead costs and overall rationalization. As often as not this has been in the direction of facilitating continental integration.**

Confusion prevails at another level when we come to banks. Again Canadian capitalist control of banks is presented as evidence of a financial fortress of independence. The detailed study of comrade Dowson on this point, and the examination at a different level in my own contribution, illustrate that in fact they can operate as a machine of integration (emphasis by the web ed.) While it is this feature of Canadian banking that deserves most attention, it is worthwhile pointed out possible portents of U.S. ownership that will serve to reinforce this trend. The following is one of a series of questions and answers prepared by the advisors to the President of the Bank of America for a directors' meeting. While the document is confidential, it was leaked to Prof. Fred Goff of the University of California by a contact of the U.S. Latin America Studies Group because of the light it shed on U.S.-Latin American relations. Prof. Goff was kind enough to pass on to me the question dealing with Canada:

Q. "Where is our Man-on-the-Spot in Canada? Bank of America has no physical presence in a country where approximately three fifths of the investments are owned by Americans.

A. "In 1967, legislation respecting foreign bank presence in Canada was enacted. Although an exception was made in the case of an existing smaller bank, the effect of the legislation is to prohibit foreign banks from owning or operating branches in that country. Bank of America does not therefore have branch representation in Canada.

"However, our bank has representatives who travel frequently to Canada from San Francisco. The Men-on-the-Spot carry the full range of our bank's services to a rapidly growing corporate clientele in that country. Bank of America travellers cheques, now being sold through more than one thousand outlets across Canada, continue to carry our bank's image to a very large segment of the Canadian populace. In 1968, four of Canada's largest banks introduced a common credit card -- "Chargex" -- under a licencing arrangement from the Bank of America. The Chargex card carries the identical colors of our BankAmericard and is fully interchangeable in all areas where our BankAmericard and its licensee bank credit cards, both domestic and foreign are accepted.

"We are continually seeking opportunities to increase our presence in Canada to the extent allowed by Canadian laws and regulations. In June 1970, Bank of America Corporation acquired 5% of the voting shares of the Investors Group. One of the stated objectives of the Investors Group is to create a service organization dedicated to meeting the numerous financial requirements of the public. The Group has substantial interests in operating companies engaged in selected areas of the financial industry. The aim of the company is to ensure that it will be in a position not only to maintain its existing wide range of financial services but to add to them in

order to serve the public need. The expertise and wide experience which Bank of America will bring to the Group are expected to assist it materially in achieving these objectives."

Meanwhile, back at the document, one's relief at the first presentation of Canadian evidence on these pages (10, 11) is marred only by the fact that one citation (Levitt) contradicts the interpretation the author intended, while the other leaves unanswered the key question of whether Canadian and American capitalists are undergoing a process of integration. **We are even treated on page 12 to a delightful case of statistical hucksterism: "Canadian corporate investment abroad bulks roughly as large in relation to the size of the Canadian economy, as U.S. foreign investment in relation to the U.S. economy."** And so, without fear of contradiction, we come to the conclusion that Canada is "an independent capitalist state — an imperialist and oppressor state" (*Emphasis by the web ed.*)

Point 14 tells us that "nationalism is the main ideological cement of bourgeois rule in Canada." Perhaps one might add that the bourgeoisie is being very conspiratorial about this since they keep it fairly quiet. At any rate, it is here that we first receive the hint that nationalism is to be the whipping boy for liberalism, which the P.C. has an apparent distaste for isolating as a major problem facing the vanguard. Nationalism will play the role of bulwark as the bourgeoisie attempts to extricate itself from the dilemma of "driving ahead towards full continental integration" (this the policy of an independent combative bourgeoisie??) and recoiling to stave off the radicalization by "defending the main concentration of Canadian capital, within Canada's borders."

"Canadian capitalism cannot resolve this contradiction," the document states. Before going on to ask the more important question of how they will try to resolve it, we might more humbly ask how the P.C. attempts to resolve the contradiction of an independent imperialist bourgeoisie (see p. 12 and earlier) (of the P.C. document) "driving ahead toward full continental integration." (*Emphasis by the web ed.*)

Point 15 asks how nationalism can play a progressive role when there are no national tasks to be completed. (The methodology suggested by this technique of questioning is interesting. Might we ask if there is an historically progressive role to be played by social democracy? At any rate it is worth pointing out as an aside that the P.C. does not show sterling qualities when it comes to asking relevant questions that go to the heart of a problem.) Far from being progressive, "the nationalist illusions of the working class, carefully fostered by social democratic misleaderships, and today by the Stalinists as well, can be the bridge to break them from their allegiance to working class organizations and line them up behind the fascist gangs." One might ask what the use of fascist gangs would be if the working class was lined up behind them, but that would be to take undue advantage of hysteria. Since we will deal with the first point later, (it is also dealt with in my earlier contribution) we shall be content in pointing out that the PC is not really posing the most suggestive questions and parallels at this state of the argumentation.

Point 16 again stresses the point that nationalism is "the religion of the jail-guards" against the Québécois and the working class. What then is continentalism? Nationalism, like the strong Canadian bourgeoisie and its state, is apparently without contradictions. We are not even permitted the proverbial "nationalism of the charwoman."

Point 17 is mainly interesting as an illustration of the criteria employed throughout the document for the use of citations. Quotations are broken off once the area of agreement ends.

Point 18 assures us that there is no "new nationalism" on the horizon. While admitting that "nationalism receives different expressions by different social classes",

dialectical materialism can apparently not incorporate any but the two categories of the P.C. — the nationalism of oppressed nations and the nationalism of the imperialist nations. What about imperialized-imperialist nations? Or is such a non-static category beyond the grasp of the PC? (Emphasis by the web ed.)

At any rate how does the rule of thumb of the PC aid us in evaluating a sentiment? If "nationalism receives different expressions by different social classes", of what relevance is it that "the pursuit of national goals by elements of every social class will have a common point of reference, the situation of the nation as a whole and the tasks that flow from this". This relevance must be clearly defined. Certainly it means that national goals are of no use to the English-Canadian revolution. That is not the subject up for debate in the movement. The debate centres on the "different expression by different social classes". The shotgun approach of the PC in this respect amounts only to a stab in the back designed to muddy up the issue.

Point 19 continues the crusade against "what is thought to be US domination of Canada". We learn that "the real enemy in Canada is not US imperialism but imperialism itself as a world system". The problem with this statement is that it is also true both for the United States and Vietnam. It is a truism, and while we might congratulate the PC for its breadth of insight, we might ask advice on how to concretize it.

In noting the step backward that results from the attempt "to generalize from opposition to US imperialist domination of the colonial world to US domination of Canada", one wonders at first if this is the familiar refrain in favour of single issue mass movements. But, alas, no. They are merely lamenting the lack of "understanding of the character of imperialism as a world system and to the imperialist character of the Canadian ruling class". Is the Political Committee now considering injecting this line in into the V.M.C.? (*Vietnam Mobilization Cttee --ed.*) Or are they merely using nationalism as the whipping boy for their failure to inject such a propagandistic understanding into the anti-war movement?

At any rate, we are still left with the unfortunate problem that "world imperialism as a system" in Canada means U.S. ownership of the economy. Or is it the property of abstract world imperialism? Or is it the property of the Canadian bourgeoisie?

Point 20 answers the question -- who rules Canada? After an interesting discourse which states, among other things, that "A capitalist economy is fundamentally anarchic; its blind forces do not submit readily to the control of bourgeois states" (a statement which serves usefully to undermine most of the previous analysis), the Political Committee comes up with the answer that Canada "is ruled by the Canadian state, headed by governmental cabinet, 'the executive committee of the ruling class.'" Here we have the definitive indictment of the empiricist method and objective question techniques currently used in elementary school social studies! The question remains unanswered: are the Canadian and American ruling class approaching integration and does the Canadian ruling class, in its own right, control the economy? (Emphasis by the web ed.)

.The "myths and fallacies" of point 21 include a misassessment of the role of imperialism in colonial countries. It does not universally "hold the economy as a whole in a state of economic backwardness." It does not "block" economic development. It distorts it.

This incorrect definition is, of course, not accidental. It is part and parcel of the Manicheanism of the Political Committee document which prohibits it from seeing any shades between devil imperialism and devilised, imperialised countries. Unfortunately, nuances exist in real life, nuances which Marxist theory must treat if it is to avoid ambiguity or dogmatism. There is, of course, a qualitative difference between colonial and imperialist economies. But within these categories, a variety of economic structures and behaviour persist. The Political

Committee of course, is reluctant to admit this since it opens the way for a category that makes them shudder -- 'imperialised imperialism.' To avoid this possibility, they start off with an unrealistic definition of colonialism. On the other side of the coin, an equation is made between the imperial natures of Japan, Britain, U.S. and Canada.

At any rate, proceeding along with the Political Committee: point a) is a bit too garbled to figure out; point b) introduces the false methodology of comparing the behaviour of U.S. with Canadian capital without identifying the socio-economic structures of the economy and the nature of Canadian industries (this is the methodology of the bourgeois economist A.E.Safarian); point c) insinuates that imperialism only "takes advantage of" wage differentials, without defining the structures that determine the advantages; and so on. The crucial error in all these points, one common to liberal political economy, is to utilize a comparative analysis of U.S. and Canadian capital in the same situation. It is a behavioural rather than structural approach. The same would hold true to any capital in the world. It is not a relevant question.

It is not surprising that they uncover "no evidence" that U.S. investment damages the interests of Canadian workers. (We presume that a certain context is meant here.) (*Emphasis by the web ed.*)

The logic of this is then developed in a voluntarist way by asking if we prefer Canadian to American capitalists. This might be put in perspective by asking if we prefer Vietnamese to American bosses. This is a totally false method of argument. It can lead only to a maximalist political methodology. "The problem is not U.S. imperialism (substitute abortion laws) but imperialism per se" (substitute women's liberation, bourgeois laws). The question is not one of the will of the vanguard but the consciousness of the working class. If they raise the demand to nationalize the energy industry, do we counterpose the demand to nationalize Eatons or better still, the world imperialist system?

Part 23 is correct to search for the roots of anti-imperialist sentiment in objective reality. One might look for starters to the youth radicalization and the Waffle. The contradictions of this sentiment reflected both the contradictions of the political economy and the contradictions of the milieu. Insofar as they developed a nationalist strategy (ie. autarchy, the Canadian car; etc.), they are led to dead-ends which included the parochialism of rejecting Roberts Rules of Order and even of (*the shorter work-week demand*) '30 for 40' (on the grounds that it would hurt Canadian capitalists -- this argument was advanced in St. Andrews-St. Patricks N.D.P. (*NDP, the Canadian labor-based federal party --web ed.*) It also led them to an increased alienation from Canadian capitalism and to an elementary understanding of the N.D.P. (see [*Waffle leader*] Laxer's early articles attacking the new left for adopting American new left ideology and ignoring the N.D.P.)

Part 26 is at least abstract enough to have elements of correctness.

Part 28 correctly scores the Waffle for some of its weaknesses. However, in rejecting the scorn of those "who loved much but not well" we should point out that Waffle was unequivocally socialist.

Point 29 puts forward suggestions and formulas combatting nationalism. Hopefully, considerable attention will be directed to "grasp hold of the progressive essence" of issues although we have, according to the Political Committee's analysis, no expectation that they will have anything but a reactionary essence. The main problem here is not so much the line that is proposed as the self righteous chip on the shoulder that comrades are expected to take into areas where people are groping for political clarity. Apart from that, **they offer no way of gauging to what extent nationalism will be defining the issues of the radicalization. Is the Political**

Committee statement merely a catechism of answers to nationalists or is it a means to make projections on the development of the radicalization? That is the real mark of tailism, not the sensitive orientation to the significance of nationalist sentiment within the left.

As we "cut across" concerns and advance the "same slogans" for French, Japanese or American capital, one wonders exactly what relevance our little crusade will have apart from isolating us from many of the emerging layers of the radicalization (*emphasis by the web ed.*)

Point 30 is a bit hackneyed but not bad. The problem is that the crusade is not put forward in the context of our work, areas or projections. Apart from conjuring up a number of false enemies it fails to propose the real key to a Trotskyist intervention—Leninism. This to my mind is the key propagandistic intervention we have to make. It is the key weakness, in all areas of the radicalization. Its absence from the Political Committee's rosary is not unusual given their policies of the last year or so. Instead of Leninism, we are posed with a campaign of epic proportions and relatively little use. It is a campaign founded on poor logic, on research derived from a high school reader and a Waffle primer, on assertions that are untrue or not proven, and on politics which misread the needs of the political conjuncture.

To sum up, in terms of the main questions before the movement:

1) The Political Committee is wrong in its analysis of the nature and power of the Canadian bourgeoisie. It is a bourgeoisie in the process of integration with the American bourgeoisie and it is not able to play a decisive, independent role even in the Canadian economy.

2) The overall functions of the state mirror this process. There is no indication that the state will be used as a fortress against the American bourgeoisie as the Political Committee asserts. On the contrary, it has often acted to facilitate the process of integration. In terms of the state's repressive function, all this is ABC. The problem is to separate this from the overall process of integration. Then the problem becomes to separate the bourgeoisie's loyalty to the nation state as an apparatus of repression and nationalism as a whole. Here, of course, we will witness contradictions befitting the nature of the Canadian bourgeoisie as part of a North American ruling class.

3) The historic function of nationalism in this respect is contradictory. We will not get the clear lines that those who see the world in black and white like to see. Nationalism is not the likely ideology of a bourgeoisie seeking continental integration. Nor is outright hostility to nationalism the likely tendency of a ruling class dependant on the oppression of Quebec and the maintenance of certain vestiges of the period of national capitalism.

4) Likewise, nationalism plays a contradictory role in the radicalization. In important respects the sentiments underlying it act as a trigger to the posing of overall class tasks. As the Waffle posed it: "There can be no independence for Canada without socialism." (*emphasis by the web ed.*)

Likewise it can serve to unleash important socio-political processes. To take two examples from the student milieu: Western students rebelled against the awarding of an honorary doctorate to Harry Johnson, the Canadian continentalist, bourgeois economist and instead presented a counter award to David Lewis and Pierre Berton. One might argue with the validity of these choices but it would be sectarian not to see the opportunity for propaganda and agitation involved when students begin to comprehend the reality of bourgeois prestige symbols.

Similarly, it is common for students to complain about Americanized disciplines. It is quite clear that they are rebelling against bourgeois, immoral social science even if their rebellion is expressed in national terms. They are not calling for a return to Innis, Leacock or S.D. Clark except insofar as this represents 'critical,' 'humanist' social science. **To get side-tracked into an anti-nationalist hassle would be to waste time explaining that Canadian bourgeois professors are as bad as Americans when you could be pointing out that the only social science relevant for Canada is Marxism, a system of thought which can be posed with fresh relevance in this context. It is in this complete failure to appreciate processes that the Political Committee is at its weakest. And when you are wrong there, there is every chance that your demand, however 'transitional', will be sectarian** (*emphasis by the web ed.*)

Missing out on this aspect of the dynamic also serves to make it more difficult to correct the many errors that can spill over from nationalism. For it is clear that nationalism can also serve to derail the left from class tasks when opposition to U.S. imperialism in Canada becomes confused with loyalty to the Canadian nation-state. It is crucial that the vanguard be aware of the precise nature of this problem if its interventions are to hit home. The problem with the Political Committee's analysis is that people may be confused as to what we are opposing — a nationalist strategy or opposition to U.S. imperialism.

5) The correct program of the vanguard cannot easily be posed in terms of formulas or questions and answers. In general the situation calls for a good deal of consistent propaganda on a Red North America as the only viable strategy for the left and the Leninist party as the only vehicle of that strategy. In terms of agitation we raise transitional demands in the context of class tasks and do not accede in the least to nationalist strategy or national democratic demands (ie. autarchy, Canadian car, Canadian publishers, etc.).

The process of formulating the correct transitional demands is of course facilitated if we understand the consciousness we are trying to bridge. There is no bridge to make with nationalist consciousness if it is reactionary. If it has an anticapitalist thrust to it, however, our task is easier and will find a fruitful place and receptive audience more frequently.

To take as an example; the opposition to U.S. imperialism and its effect on the university which has disoriented many circles with the ideas of the 85% quota campaign. **The Political Committee in the latest issue of *Labor Challenge* has counterposed the view that it is Canadian capitalism not American imperialism that dominates campus. It is much more relevant to point out that individual American professors have nothing to do with the processes of imperialism. The heart of the problem can only be challenged with student faculty control, by kicking the real villain, big business, off campus and linking up with the working class** (*emphasis by the web ed.*)

That is to say: in the course of this debate we do not have two different systems of transitional demands. We do have two wholly different systems of pedagogy. That of the Political Committee is totally unsuited to reality.

This unsuitability is not accidental or a feature to be noted in passing. It is not rooted in the failure to correctly read moods or sentiments (although this is involved). It is rooted in a false analysis of the economy. A correct analysis of the economy would lead to a more accurate appraisal of the necessary essential direction which national sentiment is likely to take, or express — anti U. S. imperialism. This expression will not emerge spontaneously as polished Marxism-Leninism. It must be carefully directed by the Vanguard.

Nationalism, it might be said, is too important to leave to the nationalists. Revolutionaries must intervene to take the anti-imperialist thrust, inherent in it to a full understanding of the program and strategy of revolutionary socialism.

On all these points then the Political Committee is wrong. Thus, although it serves to clarify the fact that our movement is opposed to bourgeois nationalism, it should be decisively rejected as a document to guide our movement.